

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed **November 28, 2003**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-18. Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Colyer (USPN 5,903,725, hereinafter "Colyer"). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colyer in view of Hunt (USPub 2003/0056195, hereinafter "Hunt"). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colyer in view of Munakata (USPN 5,717,917, hereinafter "Munakata").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Colyer. Applicant respectfully points out that Colyer discloses a bi-directional link (communication channel) **between server and clients**, which can be, for example, a bus or network (see Colyer col. 13, line 18-21). Additionally, Colyer teaches proxy objects, which are **associated with a remote object** (see Colyer, FIG. 8 and col. 13, lines 19-51).

In contrast, the present invention discloses a bi-directional link **between objects** defined within an object-oriented programming system and a technique which ensures that pairs of corresponding bi-directional pointers get updated at the same time (see FIG. 4A and page 9, lines 12-31 of the instant application). Note that the "proxy object" in the present invention is associated with a bidirectional relationship, not with a remote object. There is nothing within Colyer that discloses or suggests associating a proxy object with a bi-directional link between objects in order to manage the bi-directional link.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to clarify that the present invention claims a bi-directional link between objects and a technique to manage these relationships that ensures that pairs of corresponding bi-directional pointers get updated at the same time. These amendments find support in FIG. 4A and on page 9, lines 12-31 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 as presently amended is in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-18, which depend upon claim 1, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: December 22, 2003

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665